

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Washington, DC 20231 www.USPTO.gov

Paper No. 31

Jack E. Haken Corporate Patent Counsel U.S. Philips Corporation Patent Dept; 580 White Plains Road Tarrytown, NY 10591

COPY MAILED

NOV 1 5 2001

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Renate M. Sombroek, et al.

Application No. 08/704,400

Filed: August 27, 1996

Attorney Docket No. PHN14.491A

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed September 26, 2001, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to take appropriate action in a timely manner, after the decision of March 13, 2001 by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Therefore, the proceedings as to the rejected claims were terminated. See 37 CFR 1.197(c). As no claim was allowed, the application became abandoned on May 14, 2001. See MPEP 1214.06.

The above-identified application is being revived solely for purposes of continuity with a continued prosecution application (CPA) filed on September 26, 2001.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and

والآراء

circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Cheryl Gibson-Baylor at (703)308-5111, or in her absence, Sherry Brinkley at (703)305-9220.

The application file is being forwarded to Technology Center 2600, Art Unit 2672.

Cheryl Gibson-Baylor Petitions Examiner

Office of Petitions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner

for Patent Examination Policy

cc: Anne E. Barschall

80 Benedict Avenue Tarrytown, NY 10591